UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2592nd MEETING: 14 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2592) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in Namibia:

(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);

(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);

(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2592nd MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 14 June 1985, at 6.50 p.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2592)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 7 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ouyahia, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2587th, 2589th and 2590th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mrs. Carrasco (Bolivia), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Gayama (Congo), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Makeka

(Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Murargy (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Odaka (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Malta, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gauci (Malta) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received from the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar a letter dated 14 June 1985 [*S/17271*] which reads as follows:

> "We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Neo Mnumzana, Deputy Chief Representative of the African National Congress of South Africa, in connection with the Council's current consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Council agrees to grant that request.

It was so decided.

7. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/17262, which contains the text of a letter dated 11 June from the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia addressed to the Secretary-General.

8. The first speaker is the representative of Haiti. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

9. Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Sir, I wish to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council for having allowed us to take part in this debate on one of the most worrying questions before us.

10. We are particularly pleased to see you, the representative of Trinidad and Tobago—a Caribbean country which is, like mine, a limb torn by force from the tree of Africa—presiding over the Council's consideration of the situation in Namibia. We are certain that your well known qualities as a statesman and diplomat and your commitment to the cause of oppressed peoples will be of great value to the Council in its deliberations, the outcome of which will determine the fate of an entire people which has been enslaved and humiliated for too long.

11. I wish also to pay a tribute to the representative of Thailand for the outstanding way in which he carried out his responsibilities as President for the month of May.

12. It is now at least seven years since the Council, on the initiative of the Group of Five, adopted the settlement plan for Namibia contained in resolution 435 (1978), believing that it had found the basis for a negotiated settlement which would enable the Namibian people at long last to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and national independence. That resolution, accepted by all the parties concerned, gave rise at the time to great hope in the international community. Despite scattered doubts, there were many who believed that that problem, which had lasted far too long, was going to be settled at last, thus also eliminating a major hotbed of tension in the southern part of Africa. Unfortunately, they had not taken into consideration the bad faith, intransigence and duplicity of the Pretoria régime, which, defying the authority of the United Nations and the will of the international community, is more than ever determined to persist in its colonial occupation of Namibia in order both to protect its strategic and economic interests and to ensure the survival of the odious system of *apartheid*. To achieve its ends, Pretoria sometimes uses force, sometimes cunning. At the same time, there has been an unprecedented strengthening of Pretoria's military machine, an intensification of its repression, and a consolidation of its political domination through the installation of puppet surrogates, with whom it would replace the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Moreover, its acts of aggression against neighbouring States—such as the Cabinda incident, aimed against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Angola, and, most recently, yesterday's massacre of innocent victims in Botswana—continue unabated.

13. All those facts amply demonstrate that Pretoria has not the slightest intention of co-operating in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In that regard, the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council of 29 December 1983 [*S/16237*] is particularly illuminating, when it states that all the principal questions dealt with in resolution 435 (1978) had been settled and that South Africa's intransigence was the only remaining obstacle to the independence of Namibia.

14. Meanwhile, Pretoria is determined to put into effect its own agenda, in keeping with its manifest desire to continue its colonial-type domination. In effect, its plan to install an interim administration in Namibia can be explained only by its determination to make of Namibia another bantustan or, at best, a vassal State, a protectorate. This recidivist

behaviour in itself represents a serious challenge to the international community and in particular to the Council, which has, rightly, categorically rejected and condemned that decision which cannot fail to have serious consequences for the prospects for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

15. However, we are entitled to ask what is the practical value of that condemnation if it is not followed by sanctions. Experience has proved that tolerance and accommodation only encourage Pretoria in its arrogance and intransigence. It should be emphasized in this regard that clearly the racist régime has so far been the sole beneficiary of the policy of constructive engagement. For us, trust in the good faith of the racists is nothing but naiveté, pure and simple, if not complicity. Our high regard for the truth and for justice does not allow us to accept such duplicity if we are to remain true to ourselves.

16. In the eyes of world public opinion, these meetings of the Council are the moment of truth for our Organization's credibility. If, 19 years after the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and 7 years after the adoption of a plan for a negotiated settlement of the question, the Namibian people is still suffering under the yoke of the racist occupier, it is largely because so far certain permanent members of the Security Council have not fully shouldered their responsibilities.

17. In that context, we must quote the spokesman of the South African régime, who told the Council on 10 June:

> "The time has come for Western countries in the United Nations to take a stand for the promotion of the democratic values which they profess to espouse." [*2583rd meeting, para. 223.*]

18. We absolutely agree with him about that. We are pleased to note that within public opinion in the Western countries the struggle is continuing to bring their Governments, belatedly, to subscribe to the following values: the right of peoples to self-determination, the elimination of racism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and *apartheid*, the legal equality of States, respect for national will, co-operation between peoples and States, on the basis of mutual respect, and so on.

19. It is our most fervent hope that that appeal will now be heeded by those States, which must honestly and seriously assume their obligation to seek in complete good faith, with the other members of the Council, all possible ways and means to achieve the decolonization of Namibia, by the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which remains the only basis for a universally acceptable politically negotiated settlement, excluding all pre-conditions or conditions that have nothing to do with the substance of the problem. Then will begin for the Namibians the rehabilitation they have so long awaited, by their regaining their sovereignty, their dignity, their political and economic freedom and their humanity. Then justice will prevail.

20. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): We should like to express our condolences to the people of Botswana, who suffered losses from the attack last night from South Africa. The United States condemns South Africa's attack on Gaborone.

21. As we said in the Council earlier this week, respect for the national sovereignty of all States and the inviolability of international borders are key principles in international relations, and no State can arrogate to itself a right to violate those principles. We cannot and will not condone violations of those principles. Such cross-border violence only complicates efforts to bring peace to the southern African region.

22. In saying that, my Government in no way condones or accepts recent bombings and acts of violence within South Africa, nor can we accept a right to launch such actions from beyond its borders. But this latest South African action comes against a background that raises the most serious questions about that Government's recent conduct and policy.

23. Public claims of a policy of mounting military operations in neighbouring sovereign countries have been made by senior officials of that Government, in South Africa and here at the United Nations. Actions have been taken that placed at physical risk United States lives and property. My Government categorically rejects such a policy, which is antithetical to the goal of working for a negotiated solution and an end to southern Africa's cycle of violence.

24. Yesterday's attack on Botswana is particularly deplorable in the light of the recent progress made by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of both Botswana and South Africa to control cross-border violence and settle mutual problems by discussion. Mechanisms had been put in place to handle security concerns of both sides, and South Africa's action calls into question its sincerity and seriousness in dealing constructively with those matters.

25. In the light of this and other recent events, we have decided to call our Ambassador to South Africa, Herman Nichols, home on consultations to review the situation.

26. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

27. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is a great pleasure for me warmly to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I am fully convinced that your well-known experience and skill will bring success to the deliberations of the Council.

28. On this occasion I must also express my appreciation to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand for the wise way in which they conducted the deliberations of the Council in the month of May.

29. The meetings of the Council following a request by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the participation of a large number of Ministers and delegations in this

general debate on Namibia represent an expression of political solidarity with the people of Namibia struggling under the leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, and we are indeed honoured to have with us today its distinguished leader, Mr. Sam Nujoma.

30. Perhaps those who have been following this debate since its beginning will see the truth of a number of firmly established facts, which we can summarize as follows.

31. First, this wide-scale participation in a debate on the question of Namibia reflects the increasing concern of the international community regarding developments in southern Africa in general and in Namibia in particular in the light of the latest manoeuvre of the racist South African régime, which is trying to implement a declaration establishing a so-called interim government in Namibia. Furthermore, this emphasizes the continuing condemnation of that declaration and the call for its abrogation. The installation of a group of puppets aimed at supporting the policy of *apartheid* and entrenching illegal control of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa merely represents a part of the attempts of the racist Pretoria régime to hamper and sabotage United Nations efforts and the efforts of the international community to achieve real independence for Namibia in accordance with the United Nations plan set out in Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 539 (1983).

32. Secondly, in addition to South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia, the situation has become all the more dangerous because of the racist régime's plans to transform Namibia into a militarized territory and use it as a springboard for acts of aggression and sabotage against neighbouring independent African States, especially Angola, which is suffering occupation of parts of its territory by the racist forces. This indeed is a great threat to peace and security in the region and in the world as a whole. In this context my delegation wishes to denounce the attack upon Botswana this morning, which is part and parcel of the aggressive policy perpetrated against independent States neighbouring South Africa.

33. Thirdly, the dangerous and explosive situation now being suffered by the southern Africa region is virtually the result of the stand of the United States and some other Western States that support the South African racist régime by all political, military and economic means. The aim is to maintain their monopolizing interests in Namibia and South Africa under different forms and guises. This renewed debate on the question of Namibia in the Council stresses the awareness of the Namibian people and the international community regarding the manoeuvres of deception and procrastination being made under the guise of the so-called policy of constructive engagement and the creation of excuses to hamper implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In this context the failure to adhere strictly to the Security Council resolution on the prohibition of military co-operation with the racist régime of Pretoria, the continued hampering of any measure taken by the Council to impose mandatory sanctions against the racist régime, and the official visits undertaken recently by the Prime Minister of that régime to a number of Western States—all are part of a continuing attempt to break the international isolation imposed on the racist régime by circumventing United Nations resolutions, particularly Council resolution 435 (1978). This connivance between imperialist circles and the minority racist régime in South Africa has increased the racist régime's flouting of international resolutions and demands. Indeed it has encouraged it to wage further aggression against the African front-line States; it has encouraged it to destablize them and to threaten their security and stability. The Declaration [*see S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*] issued by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi in April 1985, states that the policy of constructive engagement undertaken by the current Administration of the United States is in principle intended to encourage and support the racist régime. It further declares that that policy encourages the increasing intransigence of the racist régime as well as the policy of continued aggression and blackmail that it imposes on neighbouring independent States.

34. Fourthly, the question of Namibia is one of national liberation, and in the first place it is a question of decolonization. For that reason, those who have spoken before me have condemned all attempts to link Namibian independence with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. This Council has rejected that linkage in its resolution 539 (1983). Furthermore the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries stressed its condemnation and rejection of the linking of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) with extraneous issues that have no relation whatsoever to Namibian independence and stated that it runs counter to the United Nations plan and constitutes intervention into the internal affairs of Angola and an infringement of its sovereign rights as an independent State.

35. In the light of these facts, Democratic Yemen stresses its full support for the contents of the declaration of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau. Furthermore, it renews its complete support for the struggle of the people in southern Africa and of their national liberation movements, particularly SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, in their just struggle against occupation, oppression, discrimination and *apartheid*.

36. We call for immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We believe that the Council must set out concrete steps to ensure Namibian independence so that it may give credibility to its resolutions. We furthermore call for condemnation of all racist attempts aimed at hampering implementation of Council resolutions as well as condemnation and rejection of all "internal settlements" imposed on Namibia by the racist régime against the will of its struggling peoples. Furthermore, we call for rejection and condemnation of all attempts to link Namibian independence with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

37. We stress our support for the front-line States as they face the continued acts of aggression and sabotage, as well as the economic siege imposed by the Pretoria racist régime. We call on the Council to impose comprehensive manda-

tory sanctions against the South African régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

38. The people of Namibian is the victim of the racist and colonial policy of the South African racist régime and its imperialist allies. These allies, which provide it with every political, economic and military assistance, are the very Powers which provide assistance to the racist Zionist régime, which is practising its aggressive and barbaric policy against the Arab people in Palestine. The indentical nature of the two racist régimes in South Africa and Israel is indeed what has led today to their close co-operation in all fields and particularly in the military and nuclear fields. This assistance has the aim of prolonging the subjugation and colonization of the African and Arab peoples. We are convinced that the struggle of the peoples of South Africa, Namibia, Palestine and the other Arab peoples will be crowned with victory. We are convinced that the dangers of the racist policy will be eliminated, as it is a policy which is a source of grave danger to peace and is contrary to the principles of the Charter.

39. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Botswana, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

40. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Sir, the coincidence of your assumption of the presidency of the Council with the crucial Council debate on the question of Namibia is very welcome indeed. We have no doubt that under your skilled guidance the Council will be imbued with a new sense of purpose as it continues to strive to live up to the expectations of the Namibian people. We wholeheartedly repose our confidence in you. In no small measure, your predecessor also deserves our sincere admiration for his yeoman service to the Council in the month of May.

41. We are once again compelled to come to the Council to plead Namibia's case, if it needs any more pleading at all. We are fully aware that everything that needs to be said about that betrayed trust of mankind has been said. Every trick in the book has been employed to try to remove the impediments that have been placed in the way of the Territory's progress towards liberation. Seminars, conferences, both ordinary and extraordinary, special sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and the Council for Namibia and numerous meetings of the Security Council have been held in the past seven years to facilitate and expedite the peaceful decolonization of the Territory by way of the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978)—all without success. We know the reason why this is so, why we cannot implement a plan which the Council unanimously adopted seven years ago.

42. The problem we face today as we seek to implement that plan is the same problem we have faced throughout the unpredictable life of resolution 435 (1978). It is the same problem we faced at the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in 1981, in New York in the summer of 1982 and ever since. It is the problem of negotiating the future of Namibia with a South Africa that has turned bad faith into a profession.

43. The record is unmistakable. It is replete with glaring instances of bad faith. Each and every one of the seven years during which we have been trying to implement resolution 435 (1978) has been used by South Africa as an opportunity to promote an internal settlement in Namibia with the clear purpose of subverting any United Nations solution to the Namibian problem. This is so despite Pretoria's protestations of good faith. Let us recall, to mention only a few glaring examples, the internal elections of 1978, glorified by the South African representative in his speech on Monday, a provocative aberration which caused even the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Western five to go on a hapless pilgrimage to Pretoria; the so-called second-tier elections of 1980; the repeated somersaults on the non-issue of United Nations impartiality; the persistent invasions and occupation of southern Angola and the merciless massacre of Namibian refugees in that country every time a breakthrough in the negotiations was thought to be imminent. Finally, there was the linkage, the ultimate in Pretoria's bad faith, now complicated by yet another internal colonial artifice: the so-called interim government, whose real purpose even South Africa must be really hard put to explain with a straight face.

44. Then there was the recent discovery by Angola that the purported withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola was a cynical diversionary tactic designed to dupe the People's Republic into believing that there were at long last no more South African troops in that country. It discovered that South African commandos were in fact deep into the other side of Angola, still as determined as ever before to destroy that front-line State's vital economic infrastructure. Is there any need for more proof of what we are up against?

45. Yet South Africa is portrayed today as a lover of peace, a harbinger of political stability and racial harmony in the southern African region, legitimately deserving of the gratuitous benefits of constructive engagement. The contrary is true; for if South Africa were indeed a lover of peace and a harbinger of stability and harmony in our region it would have been co-operating in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), hailed by the world as a historic blueprint for the peaceful decolonization of Namibia, a Territory held for so long in brutal bondage. It would not have been manufacturing one excuse after another every time we prepared to take the final step towards the peaceful liberation of Namibia through the implementation of the United Nations plan. Our region would not have been transformed into a war zone, a veritable cockpit of bloody conflict, where a growing assortment of dissident movements are mercilessly sowing death and misery at the behest of the white minority régime in Pretoria.

46. Only early this morning my own country became the latest victim of the murderous activities of the Pretoria régime. Under the cover of darkness, in the fashion of the Maseru attack almost three years ago, South African commandos entered the capital of my country in the early hours of this very day, where they snuffed out in cold blood the lives of approximately twelve innocent South African refugees and Botswana citizens, leaving many others wounded and maimed.

47. This senseless and dastardly act was, as usual, unprovoked and unwarranted, for no one in his right mind, even in Pretoria or anywhere else, can be so ridiculous as to suggest that the people of Botswana would permit their exposed capital, of all places, to be used as a military base for guerrilla attacks against South Africa—and despite the fact that South Africa knows only too well Botswana's position on the question of guerrilla bases. The whole world knows this position, as well. Indeed, what the South African commandos found when they arrived in our capital were not military bases, but civilian houses, which they proceeded to destroy with all their contents, including a five-year-old child, who even in South Africa's warped sense of morality cannot be regarded as a guerrilla of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC).

48. And this is the South Africa which in the logic of those who apologize for that régime has become a peacemaker who deserves all the benefits of doubt. What peace can be made by the cold-blooded murder of innocent refugees who, in any case, are already victims of racial tyranny and political persecution? What peace can be made by pursuing them, these victims of racial tyranny, and murdering them even in their places of refuge, in foreign lands? Indeed, what peace can derive from the contemptuous disregard for the time-honoured laws and norms of behaviour which govern relations between and among nations?

49. I now go back to the subject of Namibia.

50. In his report of 6 June 1985, the Secretary-General states that "there has been no change in the position of South Africa" [*S/17242, para. 45*] on the question of the linking of the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban forces in Angola. South Africa has also refused thus far to reveal its choice of the electoral system to be used in the conduct of United Nations-supervised elections in Namibia. It has further bedevilled prospects for Namibia's peaceful transition to independence by the provocative steps it has recently taken to prepare Namibia for unilateral independence. The implications of this latest act of bad faith on the part of South Africa are obvious.

51. There can be no doubt that the setting up of a so-called interim government in Namibia at a time when all efforts should be devoted to breaking the deadlock that has for so long now impeded the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is extremely unhelpful and provocative, to say the least. It shows quite clearly that South Africa has not abandoned its antipathy to a United Nations solution to the Namibian question: it still hopes to frustrate resolution 435 (1978) to death. If South Africa can help it, Namibia should be unilaterally delivered to the internal puppets to enable Pretoria, like Pilate, to wash its hands of the issue and thus confront the United Nations and the world at large with the so-called facts on the ground, or new realities, which should be recognized by resolution 435 (1978). This is South Africa's plot, for one cannot find any other reasonable explanation for the setting up of an interim government in Namibia whose existence in the prevailing circumstances can serve only to sabotage the United Nations plan and pollute the whole atmosphere around the Namibian question.

52. Indeed, the whole atmosphere around the Namibian question has become so polluted that, listening to the South African representative's speech the other day one felt as if one was listening to bandit Jonas Savimbi's propaganda. The speech debated the issue of Angola's internal affairs instead of addressing the question of Namibia. The Council was treated to a lengthy and presumptuous peroration about the alleged denial of the right of self-determination to the Angolan people, as though the meeting had been convened to discuss the situation in Angola. The South African representative's assertion that "the peoples of Angola and [Namibia] both wish above all else to exercise their right to self-determination" hit our ears as a very curious assertion by the representative of a country in which the enjoyment of the right of self-determination is racially determined—a country more than two thirds of whose citizens are brutally treated as aliens without rights in their own country.

53. The representative also had the audacity to charge that in both Angola and Namibia "political objectives are pursued by violence rather than by peaceful means and national reconciliation"—an equally very curious charge by the representative of a country whose police shoot to kill peaceful demonstrators for demanding their right to self-determination.

54. This series of meetings is not convened to discuss Angola. We are here to discuss the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We are here to discuss the liberation of Namibia, not the right of the people of Angola to self-determination, or the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, or the threat of communism in the southern African region. These are irrelevant issues introduced in this debate as a ploy designed to confuse the issue at stake.

55. We all want peace in southern Africa, and we all know why we cannot have it in the prevailing circumstances. So long as the people of Namibia are denied their right to self-determination and used as pawns in a chess game of extra-continental power politics there will be war and bloodshed in our region. The peace we want is peace in freedom and liberty, not the sort of peace that must be extorted from us with the barrel of a dissident's gun, not peace at all costs, the sort that must be superimposed on the existing unacceptable *status quo*. Be it in Namibia or in South Africa, the source of conflict is the same: it is racial tyranny, the brutal denial of self-determination to millions of our fellow men who have as a last, desperate resort been forced to take up arms to reassert their violated and insulted humanity. Get rid of the racial tyranny, and peace in freedom and liberty will prevail in our region.

56. No three- or four-legged parliament at Cape Town, a constitutional set-up which simply seeks to forestall the inevitable, no interim régime in Namibia manned by the appointed agents of the colonial Power, no spawning of dissident movements in our region will spare South Africa the tragedy of wasted opportunities.

57. As long ago as 22 May 1979, in a letter addressed to the then Secretary-General, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa stated:

"Neither South Africa, nor the people of South West Africa/Namibia, have ever retreated from their agreement to the original proposal. Indeed, South Africa insists that the original proposal, as approved in its final and definite form by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), be implemented without delay." [*See S/13345.*]

That is what the South African Foreign Minister for Foreign Affairs said in 1979. That was the spirit of 1979, and that is the spirit that we need today if we are to avoid further needless bloodshed in Namibia and the region as a whole. We do not need excuses to evade a responsibility which Pretoria sounded so enthusiastic about carrying out in 1979. Had it been carried out, Namibia would have enjoyed six years of freedom and independence to date. Many lives would have been saved and southern Africa would have been a different place today. That is another opportunity wasted on the altar of bad faith.

58. And through all this, SWAPO has remained steadfast in its commitment to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO has not added to or subtracted from the plan. SWAPO has watched with horror as South Africa demanded one endless concession after another, from impartiality packages to constitutional principles to linkages embellished with occasional utterances in Pretoria about the problem of Namibia being a regional problem that should be solved by the countries of the region—a suggestion that an internationally sponsored solution is an unwanted intrusion which ought to be avoided.

59. In January 1981 at Geneva SWAPO declared its readiness to sign a cease-fire to end, once and for all, the needless shedding of innocent blood in Namibia. South Africa reacted to this declaration by insisting on having the political images of its puppets polished first before it would consent to the implementation of the plan—only for the world to be confronted a few months after that disastrous meeting with the introduction of linkage.

60. The front-line States, as indirect parties to the Namibian issue, have also stretched their patience as far as they humanly can throughout these seven years of endless and, at times, fruitless negotiations for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). They have co-operated fully with all efforts aimed at facilitating the implementation of the plan. Every concession expected of them has been made and faithfully adhered to.

61. I must confess that we are not so sure of the role of the Western Five in all this, in recent years. Having led us on a hapless journey of blind faith in the summer of 1982, at the end of which we were allowed to issue a statement which, in retrospect, should make us all look or sound terribly foolish, a statement to the effect that we had completed all the negotiations, the Western Five now seem to have withdrawn into a limbo—with the exception of their leader, who has decided to pursue the obstructive issue of linkage to its illogical conclusion.

62. There is a terrible tragedy about it all. To imagine that resolution 435 (1978) is the brain-child of five Western countries, almost all of which have enormous influence on South Africa and yet are now pleading impotence in the face of Pretoria's obstinacy, is to imagine the unimaginable. Those five Western Powers have allowed to escape from their grasp a golden opportunity, a once-in-a-lifetime chance to make a uniquely historic contribution to the search for peace in our region. They have allowed themselves to be led by the nose into a situation where the leading and constructive role they played in the birth of resolution 435 (1978) has now become an object of intense suspicion and ridicule.

63. Our commitment to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) remains steadfast. As the leaders of the front-line States declared in the Final Communiqué of their Arusha meeting of 29 April 1984:

"the immediate objective for Namibia is and must be the rapid implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in order that Namibia may attain full and internationally recognized independence on the basis of self-determination by all the people of that country."[1]

The consequences of any further delay in achieving that noble objective are too obvious and too ghastly.

64. The authors of the present stalemate are well known. The reasons for the stalemate are also well known. It is incumbent upon the Council, therefore, to act accordingly and take the necessary measures to ensure that its own plan is implemented. That is all that remains to be done to avoid more wasted opportunities.

65. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker is Mr. Neo Mnumzana, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

66. Mr. MNUMZANA: On behalf of the National Executive Committee of the ANC and in the name of all the oppressed and struggling people of South Africa, I extend the warmest fraternal greetings to all of you.

67. I extend a special greeting to the heroic people of Namibia and to their sole authentic representative, SWAPO. I wish also to recognize the presence of a great leader of the Namibian people, Mr. Sam Nujoma. His presence here points to the great importance and urgency that the people of Namibia attach to the deliberations of the current session of the Council. His presence, along with that of many ministers of Government from various parts of the world, underlines the increasing gravity of the situation in southern Africa stemming from the lack of sufficient progress in the quest for Namibian decolonization at the level of international efforts.

68. I take this occasion to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election to the presidency for the month of June. Your competent guidance certainly places the Council in good stead as it continues to execute its immense and frequently daunting global responsibilities in our common quest for peace, freedom and progress. I also wish to thank you for allowing me to speak.

69. The urgency of the necessity to decolonize Namibia is self-evident. It is as obvious an imperative as the need to eradicate *apartheid* itself. The seeming paradox is that, though this noble objective commands a universal consensus, there is a continuing lack of progress towards its timely realization. But the paradox is only apparent. The lack of progress is not the result of a lack of means. It stems rather from the studied reluctance of a small but inordinately powerful minority of States to take the type of action which is essential for forward movement. These same States, all without exception, derive benefits from their comprehensive ties to *apartheid* and regard that crime against humanity as simply good business. They remain unmoved by the century-old struggle of the Namibian people. They remain callous in the face of the agony that the Namibian people have to suffer and the sacrifices they have had to make in their efforts to shake off the burdensome and oppressive yoke of colonialism.

70. Through diversionary tactics, ill-disguised apologies and other stratagems, such as constructive engagement, designed to dignify support to *apartheid*, they still seek to ensure that the oppression and dispossession of the people of Namibia and South Africa is prolonged indefinitely. But time is running out and a tragedy of horrendous proportions with potentially global consequences is already in the offing.

71. It used to be said that *apartheid* was running out of time. Today, despite the efforts of its collaborators, *apartheid* has run out of time. Caught between the anvil and the hammer of the ever-escalating struggles of the people of Namibia and South Africa, led respectively by SWAPO and the ANC, *apartheid* is sinking irreversibly into an economic and political crisis. A distinctive characteristic of the consequent mire of futility in which the Pretoria racist régime is irrevocably trapped is the stepped-up militarization of *apartheid*, in an effort to transform whatever strength it has still left into a murderous machine of absolute and pervasive violence against the forces of freedom.

72. This series of meetings occurs against the background of the increasing scope, frequency and effectiveness of the all-round mass actions by South African workers and peasants, youth and students, men, women and children, against *apartheid* and for a free, united, non-racial and democratic South Africa. That struggle is their school of unity. As that struggle advances so is their unity strengthened, spelling a movement towards the total isolation of *apartheid*. Part and parcel of this grand people's offensive is the heightened ability of their revolutionary army, *Umkonto we Sizwe*, to deal more frequent, more sustained and more telling blows against *apartheid's* army, police, and its economic and other vital installations. These developments have forced the Pretoria racist régime to make the rare admission that a full-scale revolution is under way in our country.

73. As the people move towards making our country ungovernable and *apartheid* unworkable, *apartheid*, never sane, is now moving to the extreme of repressive and violent insanity.

74. In the last four months *apartheid's* Fascist security forces have murdered over 400 unarmed people. Those killings continue. More than 30 prominent members of the United Democratic Front (UDF), such as Mrs. Albertina Sisulu, as well as trade unionists, community and religious leaders have recently been charged with treason because of their alleged connection to the ANC. The régime continues to murder its opponents while they are in prison. Witness the recent and tragic fate of trade unionist Andries Raditsela. It also continues to pursue them beyond South Africa's borders. Witness again the tragic fate of Vernon Nkadimeng, who was exiled in Botswana.

75. We learned with dismay this morning through a Reuter dispatch that the *apartheid* régime claimed that its troops killed at least 15 people in raids against 10 bases in Botswana "of the outlawed African National Congress which is pledged to overthrow white minority rule in South Africa".

76. At Lusaka the ANC denied using Botswana as an infiltrating route or military base, contradicting the reason which Pretoria gave for last night's attack.

77. Recently, faced with the stiff resistance of the people, the *apartheid* régime professed to halt its forced removals. Now it has resumed them and we know it will soon use violence to do so.

78. Through economic blackmail and sabotage, political subversion and outright military aggression, the Pretoria racist régime continues in its efforts to destabilize the neighbouring States, seeking to beat them into submission to its diktat.

79. The Secretary-General of the ANC, in the press release following this dastardly act by the *apartheid* régime against the Republic of Botswana and South African exiles, had this to say:

> "This act has also demonstrated yet again that the source of war in our region is the Pretoria régime. To end aggression must mean to end the *apartheid* system. Botswana has never wished nor planned to invade South Africa as Pretoria did today."

80. It used to be said that *apartheid* kills; now it has become simply genocidal.

81. Five years ago the Western Five contact group created itself with the stated objective of trying to accelerate progress towards the decolonization of Namibia. However, efforts by the United States to turn that body into a vehicle for constructive engagement led to its paralysis. The result was five wasted years which only benefited *apartheid*. It need hardly be said that it is high time to let the United Nations Council for Namibia resume its responsibilities. It is time to reset Council resolution 435 (1978) into motion with a view to its implementation without delay. The most effective means available to the international community to force *apartheid* to comply with resolution 435 (1978) is the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against that crime against humanity.

82. In this respect, I wish again to quote the Secretary-General of the ANC in the press release already referred to:

> "The rest of humanity can now see that the *apartheid* régime is not interested in peace and is committed to maintaining itself in power by conducting violence against our people and against independent Africa. The world must condemn this murder and take urgent measures to cut off this cancerous régime by imposing sanctions against it and adopting other measures for its total isolation."

83. However, the partners of *apartheid*, who consider our oppression and exploitation as nothing but good business, have in the past obstructed and frustrated efforts totally to isolate the racist régime of Pretoria. They are certain to try that again, through delaying tactics. They will aurgue that sanctions will lead to the loss of black people's jobs. This is like saying the slave plantation should not be eradicated because the poor slaves will lose their slave jobs. The point is not jobs. It is about freedom. Our people are well aware that the price of freedom is steep. They continue to sacrifice their lives for that freedom. Desirable as jobs may be, surely it must be clear that people who sacrifice their very lives are prepared to sacrifice jobs in return for freedom. They know that freedom will also be freedom to seek and obtain justly rewarding jobs which will also be consistent with their interests, training and aptitudes. The people of Namibia and South Africa, perfectly aware of the implications, are the very ones who decades ago called for the total isolation of *apartheid*. Today they repeat that call with added urgency. Surely the world, if it values freedom, must respond with action.

84. We are also told to exercise patience while *apartheid* is gently persuaded to reform itself. However, Bishop Tutu has recently in this very chamber correctly pointed out the fact that *apartheid*, like other forms of evil, cannot be reformed but must be uprooted. Besides, the history of *apartheid* is a history of the deliberate defiance of world opinion and the violation of all international laws, norms and conventions. To hope to persuade *apartheid* gently is the height of folly.

85. The Council has a very good idea of what *apartheid* understands by reform. Recently the Council had occasion to declare null and void *apartheid's* new constitutional dispensation. The Council correctly saw the tricameral parliamentary system as nothing but an attempt to further entrench *apartheid*. Meanwhile the Pretoria racist régime was marketing that ill-fated initiative as its most daring reform to date.

86. Now, *apartheid* is talking about giving South Africans the right to marry across the colour line. That right is meaningless. Only within the context of the right of the people to determine their own destiny does the right to free marriage assume true significance. Otherwise it is just another hoax. The same can be said of the other so-called reforms of the Pretoria racist régime, including the so-called multi-party conference and the related so-called transitional administration, which has already been adequately commented upon.

87. We must dispense with the lip-service that vice pays to virture. We must ensure that the torrent of words the Council will hear during these meetings does not flow into the desert of inaction. The United Nations must be allowed to resume its responsibility for the decolonization of Namibia. Implementation of resolution 435 (1978) must be set in motion without further delay. Namibia must and will be free.

88. We take this occasion to reiterate the principled and militant solidarity of the struggling people of South Africa with the heroic struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO. We do the same for the struggle of the people of Nicaragua, led by the Sandinist Front for National Liberation, and for all struggles to end the oppression and exploitation of man by man.

89. We thank all our allies, supporters and friends around the world. The peoples of Namibia and South Africa need your active solidarity today more than ever before.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.

NOTE

[1] See A/AC.115/L.611.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—June 1994—1,925